



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE BLESSING בונה ירושלים IN THE LITURGY.

ACCORDING to the statement of R. Abun¹ the prayer for the rebuilding of Jerusalem occurs three times in the fixed portion of the Liturgy; in the Grace after Meals, in the Eighteen Benedictions, and in the Š'ma'. It is obvious that R. Abun was unacquainted with the fourth occasion on which this blessing was pronounced, namely after the reading of the Haftara, because this was of later institution. In the absence of any further information as to the wording of this constantly recurring benediction, we should naturally be entitled to assume that the wording was identical in all three cases, namely בונה ירושלים. In the case of the Grace after Meals, this is made clear by the Baraitha in *Berakh.*, 48 b², in which the third benediction is referred to by its concluding words, בונה ירושלים. This name was already current in 100 C. E., for R. Iśmael³, R. Eliezer and their contemporaries⁴ in discussing the formula of the benedictions of the Grace after Meals quote this one as בונה ירושלים. We find the same ending prevalent in the time of the Amoraim⁵; and, with but few additions⁶, it has the same form in the liturgy of to-day.

We also find the same ending in the Fourteenth Benediction of the 'Amidah. In *Toss. Berakh.*, III, 25, it is cited as ירושלים; in *Jer. Berakh.*, II, 5 a, l. 9 and in Midraš Psalm xxxi. 8⁷, Jalammdenu (Jalkut to 1 Samuel ii, section 80)⁸ it is quoted as בונה ירושלים. In *Jer. Roš Hašana*, IV, 59 c, 21 and in the sentence of R. Abun which was mentioned above, also in Midraš Psalm xxix. 2, Midraš Samuel xxvi. 3, *Halakhôth Gedolôth* (ברכות, VI), on the other hand,

it is called בונה ירושלים (ו)אלי דוד⁹. In this case it is true that the ending is the same, but we note the appearance of an additional phrase, the origin of which must undoubtedly have been due to some particular cause.

We may therefore be fairly safe in assuming that according to the formula of R. Abun, the end of the third benediction in the Evening service (which is the end of השכיבנו), must have been בונה ירושלים. It is true that our text of *Jer. Berakh.*, IV, 8 c, 10 (the statement of R. Abun) does not run thus, but פורש סוכה שלום עלינו ועל עמו ישראל ועל ירושלים, but R. Jesaia Trani¹⁰ in quoting this passage gives the following wording for the concluding portions פורש סוכה שלום. And Midraš Canticum iv. 4, § 6 in a parallel passage to the Jerusalem Talmud¹¹, gives בונה ירושלים as the ending of all three benedictions. The Gaon Sar-Salom¹² of Sura and R. Amram¹³, in the name of R. Natronai, knew and objected to the benediction in this form, which also occurs in a Geniza fragment of the Friday Evening service, recently published by Schechter¹⁴. All this seems to prove most convincingly that השכיבנו in the Evening service originally ended with בונה ירושלים.

On the other hand there is a tradition to the effect that the ending contained an allusion to peace. R. Levi¹⁵ says that the word שלום forms the end of three benedictions; namely the conclusion of the Š'ma (הפורש סוכה שלום), the conclusion of the 'Amidah (עושה השלום), and the Priestly benediction וישם לך שלום. All parallel passages which without any doubt go back to one archetype, state clearly and definitely that the end of השכיבנו in the Evening service was הפורש סוכה שלום and that the last word was שלום. We are therefore bound either to overrule the opinion arrived at above, namely that the end of this prayer was בונה ירושלים, or else we must infer that the statements embody different uses or decisions of different schools in Palestine; for though we find בונה ירושלים combined with הפורש סוכה שלום, we never find שלום as the last word of the combination. It must also be borne in mind that all the

records which we have quoted show that those congregations, the liturgies of which are reproduced in the Palestinian Talmud and in the Midrašim of every description, were only acquainted with the ending *הפּוּרֵשׁ*, which they employed on week-days, festivals and Sabbaths, indifferently. It is nowhere hinted that the passage in *Jer. Berakh.*, IV, 8 c, 10, was intended for Friday evenings and the eves of festivals only, even though that referring to the Š'ma' in general cases has to be restricted to the Evening service only. But the 'Amidah in the same sentence is that of week-days, since this is the only one in which the ending *אלהי דוד ובונה ירושלים* can be found. In that case *הפּוּרֵשׁ* also must have been appropriated to week days, as Landshuth and Baer have already stated, even though this contradicts the universal custom of concluding *השְׁכִיבֵנוּ* on week-days with the words *שׁוּמֵר עִמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעַד*.

For the elucidation of this point, as also for the general questions connected with the sentence *הפּוּרֵשׁ*, it is important to notice Midraš Psalm vi. 1, in Buber's edition¹⁶. The reason is there given, why *פּוּרֵשׁ* is added on the eves of Sabbaths and festivals, and *שׁוּמֵר* on week-days in the Evening service as an additional benediction, in contradistinction to the Š'ma' in the morning. As Buber has already shown, *Jer. Berakh.*, I, 3 c, 6 is the foundation of this statement. In this passage R. Joshua b. Levi quotes Psalm cxix, verse 164¹⁷, in order to explain the seven component parts of the Š'ma' and its blessings. This general statement is developed in the Midraš, but not, as one would expect, in consonance with the above-mentioned Palestinian usage (according to which the regular concluding formula for every day in the year, without exception, was *הפּוּרֵשׁ*), but curiously enough *פּוּרֵשׁ* is the ending for Sabbaths and festivals, and *שׁוּמֵר* for ordinary week-days. We will show later on that this was the Babylonian usage and it is therefore highly probable that the passage quoted from the Midraš originated from some place following the Babylonian ritual. This passage, however, shows unmistakable signs

of Palestinian influence. In Palestine the portion ויאמר was not read in the evening Š'ma'; this is perfectly clear, not only from the statement of R. Zidkiya b. Abraham¹⁸, but also from the much older remark in the *Halakhôth Gedolôth*¹⁹. Moreover, the passage in the Midraš says that this was the universal custom, and no particular place is mentioned. Is it perhaps possible that שומר was the concluding formula in Palestine also?

The oldest edition of the Midraš on the Psalms, several MSS., Jalkut Makhiri on Psalms vi. 3, and Abudraham, in quoting the passage (as already stated by Buber), simply contain the words מוסיף פורש סוכת שלום and say nothing about the ending שומר. Accordingly, the original wording of the Midraš (as Buber has also remarked) seems to have agreed with the Jerusalem Talmud and all the Midrašic literature, as regards the universal prevalence of the form הפורש. The passage was altered by later scribes in conformity with the usages of their particular countries. They simply added בשבת ויום טוב, ובחול שומר עמו ישראל²⁰, to the sentence. In support of this theory it should be noticed that in the Midraš the variation for Sabbaths and festivals is mentioned first, and the rubric for week-days later. As far as our information reaches, שומר seems to have been unknown in Palestine.

Among the Geonim Sar-Šalom makes the following statement about this ending of השכיבנו²¹. He says, "you ask whether שומר is to be said on the evenings of Sabbaths and festivals? This is not the custom in our Academy, but פורש is substituted, and Kaddiš is recited immediately afterwards. But in other Synagogues and Congregations they say שומר, and afterwards ושמרו, which concludes this portion of the benedictions; ברוך לעולם, however, is said neither in the other Academy nor in the whole of Babylon." We see from this statement that in the majority of the Babylonian Synagogues and Congregations השכיבנו terminated with שומר on week-days, Sabbaths, and festivals alike. It was only in the school called בית רבינו, and

in the school which was authoritative for the Gaon of Sura that פורם was said on Sabbaths and festivals. The questioner, who in my opinion knew only שומר as the end of the benediction, is assured by the Gaon that the schools of Babylon must follow the ruling of בית רבינו. He does not apparently wish to force his own use upon the questioner, he does not even go so far as to recommend it, for this usage seems to have been an exception. Other evidence also seems to point to the fact that פורם was unknown in Sura. R. Natronai, who, as we have seen (notes 12 and 13), opposed the old concluding formula of השכיבנו, recommends פורם for festivals. So also does R. Sar-Šalom; in this respect they only followed בית רבינו.

Thus we are brought face to face with two different usages in Babylon on Sabbaths and festivals, a fact which we see prevalent in Palestine also—בונה ירושלים, and פורם during the whole year. It is of special interest to note that only the two Academies which were authoritative for Sura observed the Palestinian usage, even though it be only to a partial extent. It is another indication of the approximation of the schools of Sura to those of Palestine, a tendency which can be clearly seen in other liturgical questions.

As a parallel to the two different conclusions of השכיבנו in Palestine, we may notice a similar phenomenon in the blessing of the Grace after Meals which ends with בונה ירושלים. In a Baraitha in Talmud *Berakh.*, 49a²², we read "how does the blessing בונה ירושלים end? R. Josê b. R. Judah says, With מושע ישראל. But does not Rabbi teach in another Baraitha that one must not conclude with two statements? How was the question decided? R. Šešeth says, He who begins the prayer with the words רחם על עמך ישראל should end with the words מושע ישראל; but he who begins with רחם על ירושלים should end with בונה ירושלים. R. Nahman says, Even though a man began with רחם על ישראל, he should nevertheless end with בונה ירושלים." As has just been shown, the concluding words בונה ירושלים

were fixed long before. Therefore R. Josê b. R. Judah (according to other authorities mentioned by Rabbinowicz, R. Josê or R. Joshua) must have had a special reason for altering the wording. He seems to have proposed the words מושיע ישראל instead of and not together with בונה ירושלים. The decision of the Babylonian Amoraim which approves one formula for certain occasions and the second for others supports this ²³. The difference between the two endings is this; בונה ירושלים lays stress on the rebuilding of Jerusalem as a central point of the redemption, while מושיע ישראל singles out the national liberation of Israel. In accordance with this the prayer itself was given a different form because על ישראל רחם was introduced instead of Jerusalem, which seems to have constituted the chief object of the prayer, as we see from the corresponding clause, ולירושלים. This form of the prayer must have obtained some support, for R. Abba in *Berakh.*, 49a says ²⁴, "He who ends with the words מושיע ישראל is an ignorant man," and Rabh himself says ²⁵, "that whoever does not insert the prayer for the restoration of the Davidic Monarchy in this sentence of the Grace after Meals has not acquitted himself of his obligation." He thus supported the statement of R. Eliezer ²⁶, and it is probable that he as well as R. Eliezer had particular reasons for emphasizing the Davidic Monarchy.

In Post-Talmudic tradition we find מנחם ציון in the Grace after Meals, in addition to בונה ירושלים. R. Eliezer b. Joël Hallevi ²⁷, and R. Jacob b. Judah of London ²⁸, quote the form ברוך אתה יי מנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים. We also find the formula combined out of the two sentences so as to read בונה ירושלים המנחם ציון בבנין ירושלים in *Jalkut*, II, 184 where *Jer. Berakh.*, IV, 8 c, 10 is quoted ²⁹ (see above). A comparison with the ending בונה ירושלים in the Eighteen Benedictions shows that in Palestine, already in the time of the Amoraim, (see above) existed in a more developed form, in accordance with R. Eliezer, who maintained that a reference to the Davidic Monarchy was to be included in

the parallel blessing of Grace after Meals. In this connexion it is especially important to note that the version of the Eighteen Benedictions³⁰ which was most probably current in Palestine, agrees entirely with the third passage of the Grace after Meals in respect of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. We may therefore assume that there were two forms also of *השכיבנו בונה ירושלים*; namely, one old ending which mentioned Jerusalem only, and a second, which added a reference either to the general redemption of Israel, *מושיע ישראל*, or to the Kingdom of Zion or David. In fact as we have seen (p. 799), R. Jesaia Trani quotes *Jer. Berakh.*, IV, 8c, 10 with the wording: *בקרית שמע פורם סוכת שלום ומנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים*. This was the form which the benediction assumed in actual practice as we can clearly see from the Responsa of Sar-Šalom and Natronai (notes 12, 13), and from the fragment of a prayer-book³¹.

The second blessing after the Haftara also points to a similar development; this blessing, in consequence of its ending *בונה ירושלים*, also belongs to the category which we are considering. In the Siddur of R. Amram³², it ends with the words *בונה ירושלים*, so also in that of Maimuni³³. On the other hand in *Soferim*, XIII, 12, it runs thus *בונה ירושלים מנחם ציון בבניה*³⁴. It can be taken as certain that *בונה ירושלים* was the original, while the latter is the product of the same period and school which introduced the words *מנחם ציון* into the Grace after Meals, Evening service, and Eighteen Benedictions. The only difference is that in this case the two blessings are not parallel, but that one is a substitute for the other. Here, as in the Eighteen Benedictions there is a separate blessing for the Davidic Monarchy.

It is extremely curious that the ending *בונה ירושלים* in *השכיבנו*, which we have seen to be the old ending, is quite unsuitable to the prayer. For this prayer is cited already in *Talmud Berakh.*, 4 b, by its initial word *השכיבנו*, and in *Berakh.*, I, 4, it is the second of the two prescribed benedictions in the Š'ma'. It is a prayer for peaceful

repose at night and for a safe awakening on the morrow. Its keyword was apparently שלום probably based on (Ps. iv. 9) בשלום יחריו אשכבה ואישן. This implies that the clause praying for good counsel and help cannot have formed part of the original prayer either. Similarly such phrases as the prayer for protection against Satan, famine, and trouble seem rather out of place in this connexion which presupposes the completion for the work of the day when man is seeking repose. This is in spite of Ps. xci. 5³⁵, where the terrors of the night and the pestilence, but no other plagues are mentioned. What connexion can the words, "Guard our coming out and going in" have in the case of one who is going to sleep³⁶? For these reasons it seems not altogether improbable that the prayer in its original setting contained merely these words *השכיבנו יי אלהינו לשלום והעמידנו מלכנו לחיים ופרוש עלינו* סוכת שלומך ברוך אתה יי הפורש סוכת שלום עלינו. A similarly abbreviated form is preserved in the curious Geniza fragment published by I. Lévi³⁷, and also in the Persian Rite described by Elkan Adler³⁸. It should be noticed that the "spreading out of the canopy of peace" in the one version corresponds to the "keeping far the terrors of the night" in the other. Both refer to protection against Demons³⁹. This scope of the prayer is quite natural. According to the opinion of R. Joshua b. Levi⁴⁰, every one ought to recite the Š'ma' upon his couch, even though he has already said it in Synagogue. The reason for this is given by R. Joseph⁴¹, namely in order to repel evil spirits. It is therefore quite natural that private devotions at home conclude with the benediction, "May God spread the protecting canopy of peace over us."

But in the Synagogue, on the other hand, where the congregation frequently read the Š'ma' and the benedictions belonging to it before nightfall, the above ending would scarcely have been suitable. In the united prayers of the whole congregation the common weal of all Israel should form the substance of the last prayer; and as the preceding

benediction closed with the redemption of Israel, a reference to the rebuilding of Jerusalem was added as being appropriate⁴². This formed the concluding portion as in the Grace after Meals. Therefore, in both cases, as also in the Geniza fragments, quoted above, which end מנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים, the individual pronounces Amen at the conclusion of this prayer, as is done in the case of the Morning Š'ma', after the blessing of the Redemption⁴³. In the cases where הפורש was also retained for the communal prayer, this benediction was understood as the protection of the nation of Israel, and על עמו ישראל was added⁴⁴; in addition to this על ירושלים was, however, added by others as well⁴⁵. There were some again who united the original short formula פורש סוכת שלום with that of the communal prayer. Thus arose פורש סוכת שלום ומנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים⁴⁶, the form which is quoted by the teachers in the name of the Jerusalem Talmud, and which occurs in the Geniza fragments⁴⁷. Since the Geonim of Sura in the ninth century opposed this composite ending, it would have originated not long before their time. However, it must have developed and been combined in Palestine, since it is repudiated by the whole of Babylon except Sura, and opposed by the teachers of Sura. It is in accordance with the Palestinian origin that the form is known to the Italian R. Jesaia Trani, and is also found in Geniza fragments.

In Babylon the simpler form שומר עמו ישראל⁴⁸, was substituted for הפורש, as the metaphor was to many unintelligible there. It was similarly used both on week-days and festivals indifferently as the concluding word of השכיבנו. This seems to have been the general custom in Babylon (see p. 801). Elsewhere it is known but to very few communities. Although Abraham Jarḥi describes it as Spanish⁴⁹, it is quoted as characteristic only of Seville and Toledo in particular. In these towns, according to Abudraham, שומר was said both on Sabbaths and festivals⁵⁰. In Sura, as we have seen, הפורש was the commonly ac-

cepted use, in spite of the general custom to the contrary. This became the general form of the prayer, and under its influence Midraš Psalm vi. 1, which originally only knew of הפורש, was remodelled.

NOTES

¹ *Jer. Berakh.*, IV, 8 c, line 10:—אמר רבי אבון בניו לתלפיות חל שכל הפיות: בברכה בונה ירושלים, בחפלה אלהי דוד ובונה מחפלית עליו בברכה בקרית שמע ובתפלה. בברכה בונה ירושלים, בחפלה אלהי דוד ובונה ירושלים, בקרית שמע פורש סוכת שלום עלינו ועל עמו ישראל ועל ירושלים.

² חנו רבנן סדר ברכת המזון כך היא: ברכה ראשונה ברכת הון, ברכה שניה ברכת הארץ, שלישית בונה ירושלים, רביעית המזבז והמשיב. ובשבת מחחיל בנחמה ומסיים בנחמה ואומר קדושת היום באמצע. רבי אליעזר אומר רצה לאומרה בנחמה אומרה, בברכת הארץ אומרה, בברכה שתקנו חכמים ביבנה אומרה. וחכמים אומרים אינו אומרה אלא בנחמה (For the wording cf. Rabbinowicz, p. 128 b.) Notice that the clause about the rebuilding of Jerusalem is here called נחמה. Cf. Raši: בנין ירושלים קרי נחמה כל היכי דמחחיל בין רחם בין נחמג.

³ *Jer. Berakh.*, VII, 11 a, 52 (Baraita):—ואכלת ושבעת... רבי ישמעאל אומר... וברכה זו ברכת הזימון, את יי אלהיך זו הון את הכל, על הארץ זו ברכת הארץ, השובה: ... *Berakh.*, 48 b. It is true that *Mekhilta*, 19 a, *Toss. Berakh.*, VII, 1, has ירושלים only, and not ירושלים. Cf. Friedmann, in loc.

⁴ *Berakh.*, 48 b:—חניא רבי אליעזר אומר כל שלא אמר ארץ חמדה טובה ורחבה בברכת: הארץ ומלכות בית דוד בבונה ירושלים לא יצא ידי חובתו. נחום הוקן אומר צריך שיכור ביה ברה. Cf. also the statement of R. Judah b. Bethera further on, and note Rabbinowicz. See also *Berakh.*, 16 a.

⁵ *Berakh.*, 45 b, 48 b, 49 a; *Sabb.*, 24 a; *Jer. Berakh.*, I, 3 d, 73.

⁶ Cf. L. Ginzberg in Nöldeke's *Orientalische Studien*, p. 624.

⁷ ברוך מיהא המתים... גיאל ישראל... ברוך בונה ירושלים.

⁸ Cf. on Deut. iii. 23; Buber, 6 a.

⁹ See Elbogen in *Monatsschrift*, XLVI, 1902, 349 sqq.; cf. also R. Samuel b. Ḥofni in Harkavy's *ורבן לראשונים*, III, 34, note 89: שנים רבי שמואל בן חפני כ"ץ, בסדר ברכות אומר בברכת ירושלים ברוך אלהי יי בונה ירושלים. פירוש ב"ח ברכות. ופליגי ברוך אלהי יי אלהי דוד בונה ירושלים. ולא פליגי. מי שאמר אלקי דוד בונה ירושלים אין צריך לומר את צמח דוד, ומי שמסיים בונה ירושלים צריך לומר את צמח דוד. עד כאן לשונו.

¹⁰ end of חדושי הענינה on p. 13 a, ed. Livorno, p. 77 b, foot:—וחכי גרסין נמי בפרק חפלת השחר בירושלמי, בניו לתלפיות חל שהכל פונים לו, חל שכל הפיות מחללים עליו בברכה וקרית שמע ובתפלה. בברכה בונה ירושלים, בקרית שמע פורש סוכת שלום ומנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים, בחפלה אלהי דוד ובונה ירושלים. Cf. Ratner, *אהבת ציון וירושלים*, I, 113.

¹¹ בקריאה שמע הוא אומר בונה ירושלים, בחפלה הוא אומר בונה ירושלים בברכת המזון. See the exhaustive discussion of the question by I. Lévi (*Revue des Études Juives*, LIII, 1907, 232 ff.); *Talkut*, II, 184, has: בקריאה שמע פורש סוכת שלום וגו'. This seems to me to indicate the process by which the present reading of the Jerus. Talmud arose. Originally the

text simply had פורש סוכה שלום and perhaps ונומר (see *infra*), in order to refer to the usual continuation of the prayer well known to all. But the copyists added the formula current in their own localities.

¹² Abraham Jarḥi in פורס סוכה:—23 b, § 3, *de mēdag*, שמו של ישראל מנחם ציון ובניה ובונה ירושלים לפי שאין חותמין בשמים.

¹³ *Siddur*, p. 43 a, שבועות:—שבוים שחוחמין:—כך אמר רב נפדונאי גאון ו"ל בלילי ימים טובים שחוחמין:—ברוך אתה " פורס סוכה שלום עלינו ועל עמו ישראל מנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים, אסור לחתום כך

¹⁴ *J. Q. R.*, X, 654:—לפורש סוכה שלום עלינו ועל:—*J. Q. R.*, X, 654 (end):—לחומר ובונה ירושלים אמן.

¹⁵ *Lev. Rabba*, 9, 9 (end):—רבי לוי גדול:—שלום שכל הברכות והפירות והמדות והקדושות שהקדוש ברוך הוא מביאין על ישראל חותמין בשלום. בקריאת שמע פורס סוכה שלום, בתפלה עושה שלום, בברכה כהנים וישם לך שלום: The statement is more carefully preserved in *Deut. Rab.* 5 (end):—אמר רבי לוי:—הניב הוא השלום שכל חותמיהם של ברכות אינן אלא בשלום, קריאת שמע חותמת בשלום פורס סוכה שלום, התפלה חותמת בשלום, ברכה כהנים חותמת בשלום וישם לך שלום. קורין:—*I*, פנחסם *Tanhuma* on *Numbers Rabba*, xxi. 1:—קריאת שמע וחוחמין בשלום העולם סוכה שלום: שמע ישראל: *I*. חותמין פורס סוכה שלום על עמו.

¹⁶ שבע ביום הללתיך, אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי, אלו שבע מצות שבקריאת שמע, יוצר ואהבה רבה שמע והיה אם שמע ויאמר אמת ויציב וגאל ישראל. ולפי שאין מצות ציצית נעשית מוסיפין פורס סוכה שלום בשבת ויום טוב ובחול שומר עמו ישראל:

¹⁷ רבי יוסי ברבי אבין בשם רבי יהושע בן לוי על שם שבע ביום הללתיך על משפטי צדקך.

¹⁸ ובני מערבא לא אמרי פרשת ציצית בלילה אלא אומרי:—*I*, 51, *Shab. Halak.* p. 21 a, שכלי הלוקט:—דבר אל בני ישראל ואמרת אליהם אני " אלהיכם אמת, *Berakh.*, I, end, and Responsa, No. 51.

¹⁹ On *Berakh.*, 14 b:—אמר רב שמואל בר יהודה אמר אמרי במערבא ערבית דבר:—*we read in Halakhôth Gedolôth*, ed. Hildesheimer, p. 23, line 16:—ישראל הכין נהיגין:—ועד השתא כמה מדינות בארץ ישראל הכין נהיגין:—למיכר באורחא וקא סברי שמע והיה אם שמע נהיגין ביום ובילהא ויאמר אינו נהנה אלא ביום: See Zunz, *Ritus*, p. 83.

²⁰ This is the reading of the MS. adopted by Buber as the basis of his edition; so also Zidkiya in *Shab. Halak.* § 51. The most significant reading is that of R. Eliezer b. Joël ha-Levi (ר"ב) on 33, § 33, *Jer. Berakh.*, I, with the addition:—לפיכך מוסיף שומר עמי ישראל: Here we see that שומר alone is the concluding formula, in accordance with general Babylonian use. But this is cited as a passage from *Jer. Berakh.*, I, with the addition:—אמר רבי: The origin of this is a matter of conjecture; for Rāgi (פרס, 58 c) does not seem to have known it. But it is known both to R. Eliezer of Worms (רדקא, No. 49) and to the Italian R. Zidkiya. The fact that Abudraham and Jacob Ašeri (כ"ר אורה חיים, 267) were acquainted with a similar passage in the *Jerus. Talmud* is no proof that it existed among the Spanish scholars, for R. Solomon b. Adrat, in quoting the entire passage from the *Talmud*, omits this clause (end of I, חרשני ברכות):—ובמדרש תלים מצאתי במזמור שנין:—(חרשני ברכות, end of I, חרשני ברכות):—לדור . . . ולפי שאין מצות ציצית ערבית מוסיף פורש סוכה שלום: So also Jalkut

Simeoni (on Ps. cxix. 92, § 478) and Jalkut Makhiri; neither of these authorities know any additions to the usual form, they deduce all other developments from Midraš Ps. vi. 1. It therefore seems that it is some Italian school which is responsible for the spreading of the above-mentioned statement of R. Levi. The Midraš must have reached the German schools from this source.

²¹ Siddur of R. Amram, p. 25 a, *Maḥzor Vitry*, 81, פדרס, 55 d:—והכי אמר—שר שלום גאון בלילי שבתות ובלילי ימים משובים במערב למימר (אומר V. P. שומר עמו ישראל לעד (בישיבה V. P.) ובבית רבינו אין מנהג אלא החה שומר עמו ישראל הוחמין פורם סוכת שלום עלינו ועל עדה עמו (ועל כל עמו V.) ישראל ועל ירושלים: ואין אומר אחרת כל עיקר אלא קרישא לאלתר ובשאר כנסיות ובשאר מקומות אומר שומר עמו ישראל לעד ואומר ושמרו בני ישראל וחותמין, אבל ברוך " לעולם אין אומרים לא בישיבה אחרת ובברכת השכינתו הוחמין ופרס סוכת שלומך ואם חתם שומר עמו ישראל לעד:—אין מחזירין אותו והכי אמר רב שלום גאון דבישיבה לא היו משנין לא בשבת ולא ביום טוב אמר רב שר שלום גאון וצ"ל בלילי שבתות:—In Aaron ha-Kohen's אורחות חיים, 61 c, § 2, about Friday evening:—ובברכת השכינתו הוחמין ופרס סוכת שלום גאון דבישיבה לא היו משנין לא בשבת ולא ביום טוב אמר רב שר שלום גאון וצ"ל בלילי שבתות:—אין מנהג בישיבה ובבית רבינו שובגל לומר שומר עמו ישראל ובלילי ימים משובים בערבית אין מנהג כמנהג רבינו לפרוש על השלום משל לעד אלא הוחמין פורס סוכת שלום ואנו דבגולה נקשין כמנהג רבינו לפרוש על השלום משל . . . למך. The words . . . occur also in פדרס, 55 d, as a continuation of the Responsum, quoted first. Cf. also the Responsum in Mueller's חשבונו גאון מורה ומערב, No. 120, which is identical with that of R. Natronai in פדרס, 55 d and שגלי הלשון, p. 25 b, § 65. Cf. פדרס, 173.

²² *Berakh.*, 49 a:—רבי יוסי ברבי יהודה אומר:—תנו רבנן מהו הוחם בבונה ירושלים. רבי יוסי ברבי יהודה אומר:—מושיע ישראל. . . . תניא רבי אומר אין הוחמין בשמים. מאי הוי עלה. אמר רב ששה פחה ברחם על עמך ישראל הוחם במושיע ישראל. פחה ברחם על ירושלים הוחם בבונה ירושלים. ורב נחמן אמר אפילו פחה ברחם על ישראל הוחם בבונה ירושלים.

²³ This was also the sense in which it was interpreted by the questioner in the Talmud, who remarked: בונה ירושלים לא. מושיע ישראל אין. Of course the answer to this—לא אלא אימא אף מושיע ישראל—could be taken to imply that R. Josë desired to retain both forms side by side, but see Raši's explanation—אם בא לחתום מושיע ישראל ולא חתם בונה ירושלים—אם לא אימא אף מושיע, אם בא לחתום מושיע ישראל ולא חתם בונה ירושלים: יצא שהשוות ישראל היא בין ירושלים: Raši means that . . . אף does not represent an addition, but merely a possible alternative. The ב in in could be adduced in support of the theory that R. Josë required both forms together; so, too, in the remark of R. Abba (*Berakh.*, 49 a): ומושיע את ישראל: the presence of ב seems to point to an addition in the prevalent ending of the prayer. But, in reality, בונה ירושלים in both cases refers to the whole prayer and not merely to the conclusion. Rabba b. R. Huna was the only one to use both endings, to the disapproval of R. Hisda. Nothing definite can be deduced as to R. Josë's opinion.

²⁴ See wording in footnote 23. R. Abba is the name of Rabh, as is well known. It is possible that since both he and R. Josë b. R. Judah, a much older contemporary, frequented the company of the Patri-

arch R. Judah, that this was the source whence Rabh learnt this greatly criticized concluding formula. But he could scarcely have dared to denounce an adherent as a בור, in Palestine. His strictures must be assigned to his Babylonian period, when he formulated the text of the prayers and found some individual who represented and propagated R. José's views.

²⁵ *Berakh.*, 49 a, *Jer.*, I, 3 d, 73:—אמר רב אילעא אמר רב יעקב בר אחא משום—: רבינו כל שלא אמר בריה וזורה בברכה הארץ ומלכות בית דוד בבונה ירושלים לא יצא ידי חובתו.

²⁶ *Berakh.*, 48 b (*Baraitha*, at foot):—חניא רבי אליעזר אומר כל שלא אמר ארץ—: חמדה מיבה בברכה הארץ ומלכות בית דוד בבונה ירושלים לא יצא ידי חובתו.

²⁷ *Berakh.*, I, 3 d, 72. Cf. *Jer. Berakh.*, I, 3 d, 72.

²⁸ *Steinschneider's Festschrift*, Hebrew part, 189, 191.

²⁹ Alfassi, on *Berakh.*, 49 a; R. Nissim, on the additions for Sabbath: see also Ašeri, on *Berakh.*, 48 b, No. 22, and שבלי הלקש, § 94, p. 34 a, by R. Jesaia.

³⁰ *J. Q. R.*, X, 657:—רחם "אלהינו ברחמך על ישראל עמך ועל ירושלים עירך ועל—: ציון משכן כבודך ועל היכלך ועל מעוזך ועל מלכות בית דוד משיח צדקך ברוך אתה "אלהי דוד בונה ירושלים: So, too, a Geniza fragment in the *Revue des Études Juives*, LIII, 1907, 238, 4, though the end is wanting there. So also Saadyah (*Landshuth*, עמודי העבודה, p. 287), and, later, the Persian rite described by Adler, *J. Q. R.*, X, 610, but this contains the ending בונה ירושלים. Samuel b. Jahya al-Magghrebi (c. 1200) quotes from the 'Amida, שופמינו כנראשונה ויועצינו כנחלה ונהגה ירושלים עיר קדשך בימינו ונהמנו, *Amida*, בבנינה ברוך אתה "בונה ירושלים. See Schreiner, *Monatsschrift*, 1898, XLII, 173, note 3. Schreiner rightly points out that this passage is quoted from memory, because Samuel was previously a Jew. Unless he confused the 'Amidah with Grace after Meals, he must have known this text for the Fourteenth Benediction.

³¹ Published by I. Lévi, *Revue des Études Juives*, 1907, LIII, 235:—נשכבה בשלום ונקיצה בשלום ופחד בלילות אל ימשל בנו ברוך אתה "הפורס סוכת שלום עלינו: ועל עמו ישראל מנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים אמן.

³² P. 29 b:—רחם על ציון כי היא בית חיינו ולעגומת נפש הנקום נקם מהרה בימינו: ברוך אתה "בונה ירושלים.

³³ ולעגומת נפש תושיע מהרה בימינו ותבנה מהרה ברוך אתה "בונה ירושלים.

³⁴ The editions, Abraham b. David and Maimuni (הלכות חלה, XII, 15) have משמח ציון. See Mueller's Commentary, p. 184.

³⁵ לא הירא מפחד לילה מחץ יעף יומם מדבר באפל יהלך.

³⁶ Existed already in the times of the Geonim: שער השובה, 349:—וששאלתם בליל יום מוב אם אומרים ושומר צאתנו ובאנו.

³⁷ *Revue des Études Juives*, 1907, LIII, 235:—נשכבה בשלום ונקיצה בשלום ופחד בלילות אל ימשל בנו ברוך אתה "הפורס סוכת שלום עלינו ועל עמו ישראל מנחם ציון ובונה ירושלים אמן.

³⁸ *J. Q. R.*, X, 605 (for Sabbath):—השכיבנו "אלהינו לשלום והעמידנו מלכנו לחיים: ולשלום ופרס עלינו סוכת שלום כדבר שנאמר וישב עמי בנה שלום וגומר ברוך הפורס סוכת שלום עלינו על ישראל עמו ועל ירושלים עיר הקודש: The form was longer on week-days (p. 609). Cf. קיבוץ השבועה הרמב"ם, 52 d.

³⁹ I can find no other trace of the metaphor of the "Canopy of peace." פֶּרֶשׁ is used in the Bible of the spreading of the roof of a tent, which was rolled or folded, or of a dress; it is also employed in the case of wings. The outspread roof of a tent is a סוכה, and the verb סָכַךְ is used in the same meaning. The commentators compare Ps. cv. 39, פֶּרֶשׁ עֵץ לַמָּסַךְ, as a parallel. In the *Pesikta* (Jellinek, בית המדרש, VI, 52) סוכה is used with reference to the protection against Demons, and R. Levi (comparing Isa. iv. 6 וסוכה חדיה לצל יומם, Ps. xci. 4 נִאֲבְרוּ יֶסֶד לָךְ) says:—כָּל מִי שֶׁמְקִיִּים: מצות סוכה הקדוש ברוך הוא מִסְכָּךְ עָלֶיךָ מִן הַמְּוִיָּקִין: Cf. *Pesikta R. Kahana*, p. 187 a, and רוקח in Buber's note. Can יְפָרוּשׁ שְׁלֵמִיה בְּנֵי וְבִינָךְ which is the Targum Jonathan version of יְפָרוּשׁ בְּנֵי וְבִינָךְ (Gen. xvi. 5), have some connexion with the reference in the prayer? Cf. *Amram*, 43 b, Isa. lxvi. 12.

⁴⁰ *Berakh.*, 4 b, foot:—אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ בֶּן לֵוִי אֵף עַל פִּי שֶׁקָּרָא אָדָם קְרִיאָה שְׁמַע: בבית הנכנס מצוה לקרואו על משחו:

⁴¹ *Jer. Berakh.*, I, 2 d, 50:—רַבִּי הוּנָה בִּשְׁם רַב יוֹסֵף מָה מַעַם אָמְרוּ אָדָם צָרִיךְ: לקרות שמע בביתו בערב, בשביל להבריא את המוִיָּקִין:

⁴² *Berakh.*, 4 b describes the שְׁכִיבָתוֹ as a נִאֻלָּה אֵרִיכְתָּה, which precludes any supposition of its having been a prayer against demons.

⁴³ *Midraṣ Psalm xix. 7*, states, with reference to Moses on Sinai:—כִּשְׁהִיָּה שׁוֹמֵעַ קְרִיָּה שְׁמַע קוֹדֵם לַחֲפֻלָּה הִיָּה יוֹדֵעַ שְׁהוּא יוֹם, וְכִשְׁהִיָּה הַחֲפֻלָּה קוֹדֵם לַקְרִיָּה שְׁמַע הִיָּה יוֹדֵעַ שְׁהוּא לַיִל: It must therefore have been a local custom, in the district where this *Midraṣ* was composed, to say in the evening the 'Amidah before the Š'ma' and its benedictions. See Buber's note.

⁴⁴ So the Geniza fragment published by Schechter in *J. Q. R.*, X, 654:—הַפּוֹרֵשׁ סוֹכָה שְׁלֹם עָלֵינוּ וְעַל עַמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבִנָּה יְרוּשָׁלַיִם אֲמֵן, and the Geonim of Sura (see footnote 21), and Saadyah (see Bondi, *Der Siddur des R. Saadia Gaon*, p. 27) all agree on this point.

⁴⁵ *Jer. Berakh.*, IV, 8 c, 13:—פּוֹרֵשׁ סוֹכָה שְׁלֹם עָלֵינוּ וְעַל עַמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעַל יְרוּשָׁלַיִם:—

⁴⁶ See above, p. 799.

⁴⁷ When once the ending was adopted for the communal prayer, other petitions were introduced, and thus the whole increased in length.

⁴⁸ עַמּוֹ points to the fact that the sentence was introduced at a time when הַפּוֹרֵשׁ no longer referred to protection against demons on the part of the individual, but, by the addition of עַמּוֹ, to the protection of the whole community against harm in general.

⁴⁹ עַל מִנְהַג סִפְרֵי שְׁחֻחַמֵּן שׁוֹמֵר: Friday evenings: p. 23 b, § 3, about Friday evenings: עַמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֲמָרֵם וְשִׁמְרוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמְרוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהַגָּל הָאָרֶץ וְכוּ' בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יי' הַמֶּלֶךְ וְכוּ'. Neither Judah Barceloni in *סִפְרֵי הַדְּתִים*, 172, nor Isaac Giat in *שְׁעָרֵי שְׂמִיחָה*, I, 61 a, knew of this.

⁵⁰ שׁוֹר, § 267, only mentions Toledo.